

Application No. 09/527,137  
Amendment "D" dated July 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 2, 2005

**REMARKS**

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies that were extended during the recent in person interview held on July 6, 2005. The amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.

The Office Action, mailed June 2, 2005, considered claims 1-19, 23-32, 35-51, 54-56, 58-69, 72, 74-79 and 84-85. All of those claims were rejected, except for claims 84 and 85, which were allowed.<sup>1</sup>

As discussed during the interview, the present response effectively amends claims 43, 2-19 and 23-41<sup>2</sup>, cancels claims 1, 42, 78-79, and adds new claim 86, such that claims 1-19, 23-32, 35-51, 54-56, 58-69, 72, 74-79, 84-86 remain pending. Of the pending claims, claims 84-86 are the only independent claims at issue, with claim 84 being directed to a method, claim 85 being directed to a corresponding computer program product, and claim 86 being directed to a corresponding computing device.

As stated above, claims 84-85 were previously found allowable in the last action. Claim 86, which includes all of the limitations recited in claim 84, should, therefore, also be found allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 84 was found allowable in the last action, as well as for the other reasons discussed during the interview.

The remaining claims, 1-19, 23-32, 35-51, 54-56, 58-69, 72, 74-79, which are all dependent claims, should also be found allowable for at least the same reasons because they

---

<sup>1</sup> Claims 1, 2-11, 15-17, 19, 23-32, and 35-42, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), and Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,536,041). Claims 13 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), and Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,536,041), and Sequira (U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0000194). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), and Knudson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,536,041), and Heckerman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,216,134). Claims 43-51, 54-46, 58-69, 72, 74, 78, 79, and 81-83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), Donald Firesmith ("An Expanded View of Messages"). Claims 75-77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,157,411) in view of Klosterman, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,550,576), Sampat et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,557,724), Donald Firesmith ("An Expanded View of Messages") in view of Maa ( U.S. Patent No. 5,818,935).

<sup>2</sup> The claim amendments have been made to fix claim dependency, and such that the recited dependent claims now claim dependency to allowed independent claim 84.

Application No. 09/527,137  
Amendment "D" dated July 13, 2005  
Reply to Office Action mailed June 2, 2005

include all of the limitations recited in claim 84, as well as for the other reasons discussed during the interview..

In view of the foregoing, all of the rejections and objections of record are now moot, such that all of the pending claims should now be found in condition for immediate allowance.<sup>3</sup>

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 22nd day of July, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER  
Registration No. 28,651  
JENS C. JENKINS  
Registration No. 44,803  
Attorney for Applicant  
Customer No. 022913

RDN:JCJ:ahm  
PPA0000000428V001

<sup>3</sup> Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, and some of the assertions of the cited art is not being specifically addressed, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status and assertions made with regard to the cited art and any official notice at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Accordingly, any statements and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any assertion made with regard to the prior art, including the asserted prior art status of the cited art or any official notice.